

Application No.: 09/751,761
Amendment dated: April 24, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated: December 23, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-38 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 have been previously cancelled. Claims 20, and 33 are objected to due to informalities which required correction. Claim 28 is objected to due to claim limitation. Claims 20, 24, 26, 33, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Swoboda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643, 803, herein referred to as Swoboda. Claims 21, 27, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda, in view of Sato, U.S. Patent No. 5,903,768, herein referred to as Sato, as applied in the previous Office Action mailed August 30, 2005. Claims 22-23, 25 28-30, 35-36, and 38 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,285,974, herein referred to as Mandyam, as applied in the previous Office Action mailed August 30, 2005. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda, in view of Mandyam, as applied above, in view of Hennessy and Patterson, Computer Organization and Design, 2nd Edition, 1998, as applied in the previous Office Action. Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the receipt of the RCE filed.

Claim Objections

Claims 20, 28, and 33 were objected to due to informalities. Applicant has made appropriate corrections and requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Application No.: 09/751,761
Amendment dated: April 24, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated: December 23, 2005

Claims 20, 24, 26, 33, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Swoboda. Applicant have amended independent claims 20, 26, and 33 to include the limitation of comparing the architectural state value of a first processor core with the architectural state value of a second processor core. Swoboda generally discloses a method for emulating and debugging digital microprocessors. Neither Swoboda, nor any of the other references cited by the examiner, disclose comparing the architectural state values of different processor cores. For example, what the examiner cites in Swoboda as teaching the comparison logic (col 2, lines 46-65), in fact, only looks at one processor. In the Office Action dated December 23, 2005, Examiner describes this section of Swoboda as inherently teaching comparison logic because in order to determine if a test was a failure or success, there must be an expected outcome. Applicants' amended claims contain the limitation of comparing the architectural state of a first processor core to the architectural state of a second processor core, which is clearly not disclosed in Swoboda because Swoboda only teaches single processor systems.

Accordingly, applicant asserts that independent claims 20, 26, and 33 are allowable and requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21, 27, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Sato. Claims 22-23, 25, 28-30, 35-36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swoboda in view of Mandyam in further view of Hennessy. Applicant asserts that claims 21-23, 27-32, and 34-38 are allowable as

Application No.: 09/751,761
Amendment dated: April 24, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated: December 23, 2005

depending from independent claims 20, 26, and 33. Accordingly, applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: April 24, 2006

By: 

Jeffrey R. Joseph
(Reg. No.54,204)
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501